

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-18 are pending. Claims 1, 7, 13 and 16 are independent. Claims 1, 2, 4-11 and 13-18 are hereby amended. Support for this amendment is provided in the Specification and specifically at page 35. No new matter has been introduced. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled. The claims, as amended, properly invoke 112 6th paragraph "means-plus-function" phraseology.

The Title is hereby amended, thereby obviating the objection.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e) AND 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 10-15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)¹ as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,519,506 to Osawa (hereinafter, merely "Osawa").

Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Osawa in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0004611 to McKinney et al. (hereinafter,

¹ Applicants note that the Office Action indicates that Osawa is 102(e) art; however, since Osawa was published on May 2, 2002, Applicants submit that Osawa is 102(a) art.

merely “McKinney”). Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Osawa in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0081937 to Yamada et al. (hereinafter, merely “Yamada”). Claims 8, 9, 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Osawa in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,442,450 to Inoue et al. (hereinafter, merely “Inoue”).

III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“A robot apparatus...
performing one or more reflective behaviors based on external stimuli;

determining that the one or more reflective behaviors are associated with a single schema; and

control means for controlling said expression means for representing the plural orthogonal states in parallel, using the correlated expressive units and the one or more reflective behaviors.” (emphasis added)

Applicants submit that Osawa does not teach or suggest the aforementioned features of claim 1. Specifically, Applicants submit that there is no teaching or suggestion of performing one or more reflective behaviors based on external stimuli and determining that the one or more reflective behaviors are associated with a single schema, as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, claim 1 is also patentable because it recites control means for controlling said expression means for representing the plural orthogonal states in parallel, using the correlated expressive units and the one or more reflective behaviors, which is also not taught or suggested by Osawa.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to, or somewhat similar to, those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 7, 13 and 16 are also patentable.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION


In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited reference, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800